



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/222,494	12/29/1998	DOUGLASS J. WILSON	L09-98-033	3069

21127 7590 02/24/2004

KUDIRKA & JOBSE, LLP
ONE STATE STREET
SUITE 800
BOSTON, MA 02109

EXAMINER

HO, THE T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2126

DATE MAILED: 02/24/2004

21

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Applicati n No.

09/222,494

Applicant(s)

WILSON ET AL.

Examin r

The Thanh Ho

Art Unit

2126

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the c rrespondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 05 December 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,11-14 and 16-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-8,11-14 and 16-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 16.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the amendment filed 12/5/2003.
2. Claims 1, 3-8, 11-14 and 16-21 have been examined and are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 11-14, 16 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng U.S Patent No. 6,151,643 in view of Rangarajan U.S Patent No. 6,260,077.

As to claim 1, Cheng discloses a method comprising connecting the application (client application 104, Fig. 1) to the information bus (106, Fig. 1) as an event consumer (client computer 101, Fig. 1); identifying data (relevant update for the software product, line 56 column 7) within the application (client application 104, line 55 column 7) that is needed; notifying (click on the continue button 411 to begin the installation process, lines 30-31 column 8) the information bus (106, Fig. 1) of the data needed (software update, line 32 column 8) from other participating applications (software vendor computer 103, line 40 column 8); receiving (indicates, line 9 column 8) notice of the data

Art Unit: 2126

needed is available (a update to provide new features, lines 9-10 column 8) by data name (Quicken 5.0, line 9 column 8) from another participating application (software vendor computer 103, line 40 column 8); requesting (208, Fig. 2) the data by name (Quicken 5.0, line 9 column 8) via the information bus (106, Fig. 1); announcing to the application from which the data was originally obtained (client application 104 informs the service provider computer 102, lines 58-60 column 17) that the data has changed (that a software update is to be undone, line 60 column 17). However, Cheng as disclosed does not explicitly teach event listener.

Rangarajan teaches an event listener (line 24 column 9) for monitoring announcements and notifications (lines 34-38 column 9). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Rangarajan to the system of Cheng because this allows a registered client to receive event notifications from a source as disclosed by Rangarajan (lines 8-48 column 9). Cheng system as modified by Rangarajan would result in an event listener monitoring announcements and notifications from application of the information bus.

As to claim 3, Cheng as modified further teaches changing the requested data (install update 212, Fig. 2) after receipt (download update 209, Fig. 2).

As to claim 6, Cheng as modified further teaches providing a view (403, 405, Fig. 4) associated with the data needed (401 Fig. 4).

As to claim 7, Rangarajan further teaches the data is a Java Object (Java, line 4 of Abstract).

As to claim 8, Cheng as modified further teaches providing (stores, line 32 column 6) descriptive and identifying information (applications, binary files, text files, and the like, lines 34-35 column 6) about the data (software updating information, line 34 column 6).

As to claims 11-13, they are apparatus claims of claims 1 and 6-7, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1 and 6-7 above.

As to claims 14, 16 and 19-21, they are computer program product claims of claims 1, 3 and 6-8, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 1, 3 and 6-8 above.

4. Claims 4-5 and 17-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cheng in view of Rangarajan, and further in view of Barnett U.S Patent No. 6,356,948.

As to claim 4, Cheng as modified does not teach specify the data name. Barnett discloses client application receives data from server computer (Fig. 2); specifying the data name (packet identifier, line 47 column 5) by way of a property (type of data contained in the data packet, lines 63-64 column 5). It would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Barnett to the system of Cheng as modified because the client computer needs to know what data it is getting and if the data is suitable for the client application, therefore the client computer can make the decision of downloading the data or not, as disclosed by Barnett (lines 34-54 column 5).

As to claim 5, Barnett further teaches specifying the data name (packet identifier, line 47 column 5) by way of a parameter (packet header 112, Fig. 7).

As to claims 17-18, they are computer program product claims of claims 4-5, respectively. Therefore, they are rejected for the same reasons as claims 4-5 above.

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments filed have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Cheng does not teach, "announcing...the data has changed" (Remarks, third paragraph page 6). In response, a new portion from Cheng reference has been cited by the examiner, which teaches the limitation mention above. The new cited portion teaches announcing to the application from which the data (relevant update for the software product, line 56 column 7) was originally obtained (client application 104 informs the service provider computer 102, lines 58-60 column 17) that the data has changed (that a software update is to be undone, line 60 column 17). The reference meets the limitation as claimed.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to The Thanh Ho whose telephone number is 703-306-5540. A voice mail service is also available for this number. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday – Friday, 8:30 am – 5:00 pm.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner for Patents

P.O Box 1450

Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Or fax to:

- AFTER-FINAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7238
- OFFICAL faxes must be signed and sent to (703) 746 – 7239
- NON OFFICAL faxes should not be signed, please send to (703) 746 – 7240

TTH
February 17, 2004


MENG-AL T. AN
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100